

MINUTES

HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING

February 2, 2009

**THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. CITY GOVERNMENT CENTER
PUBLIC SAFETY AUDITORIUM, ROOM 213**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kristen McKissick, Chair
Michael Snyder, Vice Chair
Art Emerick, Asst. Codes Administrator
Bill Fontana

STAFF PRESENT: Candace H. Stowell, Deputy Director
Craig D. Peiffer, Urban Planner

OTHERS PRESENT: See attached attendance signature sheet.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:03 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Michael Snyder moved and Art Emerick seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the January 5, 2009 meeting as presented. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1 1829 North Third Street to replace the second and third floor metal replacement windows with wood sash packs; neither the window size nor trim would be altered**

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the case report, recommending approval.

The case was represented by Robert Valentine. He stated that he had no additional comments.

Mr. Emerick moved and Mr. Fontana seconded the motion to approve the request. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

2 300 North Third Street to replace the Education Wing windows in-kind, refinish five door sets at the Church & Gathering Space, install new glass doors at 3rd & Pine Streets, install new South Street entrance, construct Vest Pocket Park and install LCD panels in existing exterior signs

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the case report, recommending approval with conditions.

The case was represented by Kenneth Hays of Pine Street Presbyterian and Douglas Hoffman and David Thal both of Weber Murphy Fox Architects.

Douglas Hoffman provided a review of the design process. He indicated that the church's previous architects were well known in ecclesiastical design, and their design intended to respect and continue that heritage. He acknowledged that the interior was in good condition and that the scope of this work was to address exterior repairs and create new spaces. Based upon the case report, he indicated that two aspects necessitated further dialogue, the glass doors at Third and Pine Streets would enhance an open and welcome appearance during service hours, adding that the interior wood doors would be pinned and locked into place. He also indicated that the proposed LCD Signage would achieve a similar effect of openness by providing live broadcasts of the services.

David Thal described the scope of work, based upon the case report and staff conditions of approval. He provided specifications for the restoration of exterior wood and metal surfaces to address conditions one and six. In response to condition four, he provided a glass sample described as Viracon Translucent Glass, Screen # 3058 lead free, and noted that the film is applied to the inside face of the glass. In response to condition five he provided a sample light fixture and noted that the finish would be that of a dark bronze. In regards to the two items previously identified by Doug Hoffman, David Thal provided an image of the proposed LCD Screen within the existing freestanding sign cabinet, and noted that the design proposed the use of an LED strip for internal illumination and the LCD Screen for broadcasting imagery. He also referenced Drawings A403 and A601 and described the glass doors as formless and clean in contrast to the historic doors. Doug Hoffman elaborated that the existing doors would always be visible, as the new doors are comprised of a sheet of glass supported by two hinges per leaf.

In response to conditions two and three, Craig Peiffer stated that pinning and locking in-place the interior doors and the installation of exterior glass doors was non-compliant with life-safety codes, citing door swing, doors in a series and door hardware. He added that in conversation with the architects, a solution may be to provide a magnetic hold-open for the interior doors, tied to the fire alarm system and the use of emergency egress hardware for the glass doors. He clarified that while the interior door hardware was not within HARB purview, the addition of emergency egress hardware for the glass doors would be visible from public view. David Thal provided two specifications for emergency egress hardware for the glass doors, and indicated that if required by code, they would select one of the solutions. Craig Peiffer indicated staff approval of Blumcraft

of Pittsburgh, Panic Device H-100, or equivalent. The HARB Members agreed that the solution was similar to that of an exterior storm door, and therefore, an appropriate addition.

Bill Fontana inquired what happens with the LCD when there is no service. Doug Hoffman stated that it is assumed it will be dark. Art Emerick asked if zoning approval was a requirement, and staff replied yes, adding that the applicant would need to submit for a zoning variance, as the signage type was not a permitted use. Bill Fontana asked for a definition of, "flashing or pulsating," Craig Peiffer replied any light source must be a constant light source. He then inquired of the applicant why they proposed the use of an LCD Screen. Kenneth Hays replied that in addition to previous comments, it was to bring the Church into the twenty-first century. Kristen McKissick referenced the approval of monitors at Dragonfly Nightclub, and it was clarified that they were located behind a window. HARB Members agreed that a screen is not a sign, nor is a free-standing sign a kiosk, and therefore, any review should be approved by the Zoning Hearing Board for use, then to the HARB for historic district compliance. Kenneth Hays stated that since the LCD screens were not permitted under current zoning regulation he would withdraw the LCD request altogether.

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Snyder seconded the motion to approve the request with the conditions listed in the staff report. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

3 234-36 South Street to replace all windows in-kind, replace fiberglass shingle roof, replace sunscreen and lighting and install new tile at the entry

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the case report, recommending approval.

The case was represented by Kenneth Hays of Pine Street Presbyterian and Douglas Hoffman and David Thal both of Weber Murphy Fox Architects.

Douglas Hoffman described the building as a community facility, housing Downtown Daily Bread on the first floor, offices on the second floor and a multipurpose gymnasium on the third floor. He acknowledged two corrections; he stated that the tiles in the entry dated to 1967, and that the design intent was to replace them with an eight inch by eight inch tile. He added that there were three types of windows on the facility, glass block on the third floor, east and west facades, operable wood frames on the second floor, east and west facades, and operable metal frame on the first floor, south façade. He clarified that the design intent was to replace all first and second floor windows with aluminum-clad wood frames, with an in-kind replacement of the style, size, operability and glazing.

The HARB Members approved the change in tile size. They opted to further discuss window replacements, stating their review specifically pertained to providing an aluminum-clad wood window in lieu of all wood windows for the west façade. They

added that the installation of aluminum-clad wood windows in lieu of aluminum frame windows for the south facade would not dramatically alter the original appearance and that the windows for the east facade were mostly obscured from public view. David Thal clarified seven windows would be replaced on the west facade, six windows on the east facade and three windows on the south facade. HARB Members agreed that consideration be given to one window type and that an aluminum-clad wood window was an appropriate replacement type for the vernacular style of the building and obscured site.

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Snyder seconded the motion to approve the request with the additional condition to permit aluminum-clad wood windows. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

4 419 Herr Street to install a new front door lintel, repair or replace in-kind the front door, enclose the side porch, install handrails on both rear porches, replace missing windows and install a new third floor window

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the case report, recommending approval with conditions.

The case was represented by Jessica Moyer. She stated that she had structural information to add to the application; Art Emerick suggested that be provided as part of the building permit application, with the information copied to City Planning Staff for inclusion in the HARB Report.

Jessica Moyer added that she was in agreement with staff conditions for approval. She also clarified that work has not yet begun, with a start date estimated for mid-February.

The HARB Members agreed to the revised design, as provided in the case report, for the inset porch.

Mr. Snyder moved and Mr. Emerick seconded the motion to approve the request with the conditions listed in the staff report. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

5 203 Harris Street to install a new front door

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the case report, recommending approval.

The case was represented by Richard Gribble of Pekala Architecture and Eric Harp of Advanced Sash and Door.

Richard Gribble provided a review of the design process, describing the original intent was to fabricate custom door identical to those found on other adjacent properties; however, cost was prohibitive. He added that through Advanced Sash and Door, he found Rogue Valley Door Company, which provided a similar style door of solid wood

construction at approximately one quarter the cost. Eric Harp added that the exact match cost was priced at \$7,700, and the Rogue Valley Door priced at \$1,600, with the custom details. A copy of the door binder was provided to Staff for reference

Mr. Emerick moved and Mr. Fontana seconded the motion to approve the request. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

6 **112 State Street to demolish and construct a new rear addition, replace the roof, clean & repoint the masonry, paint woodwork, provide accessibility upgrades, replace lighting, install new signage and replace windows on the west façade in-kind**

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the case report, recommending approval with conditions.

The case was represented by John Pryor and Luke Bressler both of Crabtree Rohrbaugh Associates Architects.

John Pryor stated that he had no additional comments and was amenable to staff recommendations.

John Pryor described the proposed signage for State Street, by indicating they were cut aluminum letters with no illumination, and the signage proposed for Liberty Street was a similar type, but would be back-lit. He further clarified the letter would not be internally lit.

Bill Fontana asked for staff clarification of conditions five and six, specifically as to the process of Zoning Hearing Board review. Craig Peiffer stated that the parapet sign proposed for State Street was not a permissible use in the SPD Zone, and therefore, HARB would be reviewing a sign that requires a zoning variance. He added that variances are only granted when an applicant can prove hardship, i.e. there is no other way to provide signage. In regards to the Liberty Street Sign, he clarified that was a permissible use, but would require special exception for the size and location. He added that this was similar to the sign reviewed by HARB at their January Meeting.

The HARB Members stated that they would approve the Liberty Street sign, “as presented” provided approval was granted for size and location from the Zoning Hearing Board. They clarified that if the Zoning Hearing Board’s decision altered the sign, the altered design would require review by the HARB Board.

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Snyder seconded the motion to approve the request with the conditions listed in the staff report. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

7 **1931 North Third Street to replace handrails along the steps and landing, and install handrails along the porch**

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the case report, recommending approval with conditions.

The case was represented by Robert Valentine and Charlene Frater.

Charlene Frater requested the HARB also consider the addition of metal spindles to be added to the handrails along the porch as a guardrail. Art Emerick replied that the spindles would be compliant with the building code. The HARB members agreed to the addition as described.

Robert Valentine stated that they had no additional comments, and were amenable to the other staff condition

Mr. Emerick moved and Mr. Snyder seconded the motion to approve the request with the conditions listed in the staff report. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

8 1933 North Third Street to replace handrails along the steps and landing, and install handrails along the porch

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the case report, recommending approval with conditions.

The case was represented by Robert Valentine and Charlene Frater.

Robert Valentine stated that they were removing the porch handrails from the application, with the intent of creating a new design based upon staff recommendations, for review by HARB at a later date. He added that they had no additional comments, and were amenable to the other staff condition

Mr. Emerick moved and Mr. Snyder seconded the motion to approve the request with the conditions listed in the staff report. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

9 1519-25 North Front Street to replace all windows and install roof-top fencing

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the case report, recommending denial of the window replacement and approval of the rooftop fencing.

The case was represented by Dan Deitchman of Riverview Manor Associates, LP.

Dan Deitchman described the replacement window selection process. He referenced his preliminary review with HARB at their January Meeting, and elaborated by stating that he has evaluated approximately two dozen manufacturer's product lines, offering steel,

aluminum, wood, vinyl and composite materials. He acknowledged that there are approximately one thousand one hundred seventy window units on the building. He stated that the original units are severely rusted, and therefore, not feasible to rehab. He added that repair of the existing windows would not achieve current safety code requirements for wind resistance. He concluded that it was not technically or economically feasible to reproduce the windows. He also stated, per staff recommendations, he eliminated vinyl windows, and due to other code requirements, eliminated wood windows. Subsequently, he was left with aluminum and composite type windows. Further evaluation included replicating the thin mullion and muntin profiles, and he concluded that neither product could match the existing dimensions nor construct the units as one piece, i.e. both manufacturers would fabricate the windows in sections, with the larger mullion profiles. Also, all manufacturers indicated that the frame would be a minimum width of two and one half inches. He further evaluated the windows for thermal efficiency, and stated the composite material provide a twenty to fifty percent increase over the aluminum products. A final evaluation was based upon longevity and maintenance. He referenced the manufacturer's literature citing the composite product is guaranteed to resist rot and warping. The operable casements offer integrated stops and a hold-open feature. Furthermore, the window screens fit behind the hand crank, which also can be folded away, further adding to the safety of the units. Other details include the use of in between the glass muntins for increased ease of cleaning glass on the upper floors. He added that the manufacturer offered five color options, and based upon a rendering from the building's architect, he selected the beige color as being the closest in appearance to the rendering (Copies were provided for HARB and Staff review). He also noted the manufacturer is within thirty miles of the property, and therefore, provides a sustainability point for reduced transportation costs. He provided the HARB Members with the five color options and a sample of the composite material. Dan Deitchman concluded his presentation by stating he is open to HARB Member's recommendations.

Dan Deitchman stated that the current windows have multiple operable sashes, which were once necessary to help cool the building. He indicated that the renovations included the addition of central air, and as such, for maintenance and safety issues, he would like to reduce the overall number of operable units. Art Emerick added that per code a minimum of four percent of the floor area would need to be calculated and converted to operable sashes to provide natural ventilation, as the central air system did not include fresh air make-up.

Bill Sturges, 1518 North Second Street, stated that on behalf of the other property owners attending the meeting (1520 and 1522 North Second Street), they felt that the windows were attractive and they had no objections to the windows as proposed. However, they would like to be consulted on future renovations including parking, lighting and screening. Craig Peiffer stated that if they provide their email addresses on the sign-in sheet, he would add them to the monthly HARB Agenda Distribution List.

Bill Fontana asked for clarification on the case report where it indicated there were other window options for steel windows. Craig Peiffer replied that he had not surveyed the entire building, but some windows may warrant repair in lieu of replacement. He added that the National Park Service Preservation Brief 13 details various methods for the thermal upgrading of historic steel windows, including the use of storm windows. He concluded by stating there are manufacturers of steel windows, referencing a recently completed restoration of the former Hazleton High School, Hazleton, PA.

Kristen McKissick indicated that aluminum windows could get closer to the original in appearance; however, agreed with the applicant that there was limited deviation between the aluminum and composite windows. She inquired if all the windows were inoperable, could the mullions be decreased in size. Art Emerick stated then the mechanical systems would need to include make-up air. Dan Deitchman, referencing conversation from the January preliminary review, stated he proceeded with replacement options other than steel, as the HARB Members had agreed to consider said window types.

Bill Fontana stated that he was comfortable with the windows as proposed, in part as they were not adjacent to the sidewalk and at the front of the property, the building set back approximately fifty feet from the sidewalk.

Kristen McKissick stated her concern pertained to the window proportions and divided lite. Dan Deitchman referenced the approval of replacement windows at the Grayco Apartments, identifying the installation of simulated divided lite used on the lower floors, and between the glass grilles used on the upper floors. He added that he didn't feel the upper sashes had the correct appearance from certain perspectives. Bill Fontana asked if the windows were considered a custom item. Dan Deitchman replied yes, and that he had priced the windows for simulated divided lite on the first two floors, but that the cost would increase by approximately fifteen thousand dollars to provide the same for the upper four floors. Bill Fontana replied that the grilles should be consistent on all floors and suggested the use of the manufacturer's grille option, "Sculptured GBG." Kristen McKissick suggested that if there were any place for a transition between simulated divided lite and other grille configurations, it would be above the first floor belt course. Dan Deitchman stated that the manufacturer only offered the Sculptured GBG Grille as an in between the glass option. He agreed to inquire with the manufacturer as to the option of using the Sculptured GBG for an exterior application. HARB Members agreed that simulated divided lite would be required for the first floor and that exterior-applied grilles would be required for the upper floors. HARB Members preferred the Sculptured GBG Option since it appeared thinner than the other grilles.

Kristen McKissick inquired if pushing the windows further into the masonry opening would provide for a more dimensional appearance. Dan Deitchman stated that they matched the original units in location depth from the outside wall. He added that if the windows were pushed inward any further it would create gaps with the masonry cant found commonly around the window openings.

Kristen McKissick stated that the lighter color (beige) exacerbated the appearance of wood and suggested a contrasting color, such as taupe. She referenced the rendering and suggested that the mullions and muntins may have had a pastel color. She concluded by stating that with the use of the composite material, the color should be differentiated from the masonry enframement. Bill Fontana inquired if the manufacturer would provide a custom color, and also inquired if the composite material was extruded. Dan Deitchman replied that the material was formed, and then covered with the synthetic. He added that he was open to another color, and stated that he would inquire with the manufacturer as to the option for a custom color. The HARB Members agreed that the final color selection could be made by the HARB Chair and City Staff.

Kristen McKissick agreed with the case report that the windows were significant character-defining features on a contributing building. She added that the HARB was only considering the change in material due to the scale of the project and the discussion was to find the best solution. She concluded by stating that the building needs intervention due to long-term neglect. She added that for viability and continued use, the substitute material, replacement windows were necessary, so as to prevent further building deterioration.

Dan Deitchman identified in the case report that the roof-top fencing will be painted black, and inquired if another color would be acceptable. The HARB Members stated that due to the limited visibility of the fencing, the applicant may select an alternate color that is in keeping with the character of the building

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Snyder seconded the motion to approve the request with the conditions that the applicant shall verify manufacturer's ability to provide custom color options for exterior surfaces for replacement windows, color selection shall be approved by the HARB chair and city staff; and the applicant shall verify manufacturer's ability to provide the Sculptured GBG Grille for use on the exterior for replacement windows, grille configuration shall be approved by the HARB chair and city staff; and the applicant shall provide a finish color for roof-top fencing for city staff approval. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mr. Peiffer announced that the Draft Harrisburg Historic District Design and Preservation Guidelines were under review by City Administration, and would be publically presented pending approval. He added that Saturday, March 21st would be the date for the HARB Retreat.

Mr. Fontana inquired if staff could develop and approval agenda for future cases, so as to condense the meeting and permit additional time for conditional

approval and/or denial cases. Staff replied that they would accommodate the request.

Mr. Fontana inquired if staff could provide contextual photographs for each case. Staff replied that they would accommodate the request.

Staff inquired if HARB would be amenable to receiving case reports via email, as they were developed. HARB Members replied that they would be open to the idea.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Emerick seconded the motion to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote and the meeting adjourned at 8:59 P.M.